

ITEMS

VOLUME 7 · NUMBER 2 · JUNE 1953
230 PARK AVENUE · NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

CONFERENCE ON NONINTELLECTIVE DETERMINANTS OF ACHIEVEMENT

by M. Brewster Smith

OVER the years psychologists have developed an impressive array of techniques for the measurement of intelligence and aptitude. In the huge programs for testing American military personnel in two world wars, and in numerous applications in education and industry, intelligence and aptitude testing have proved their usefulness. Where general intelligence or special aptitude is required to meet the demands of a job, a career plan, or a course of training, existing tests can contribute to more efficient selection, classification, and guidance and thus increase the likelihood of successful performance from the view of society, and of satisfaction for the individual. When a position requires special aptitudes for which there is no existing test, well-known techniques of devising an appropriate test are available.

The predictive accuracy that can be attained by conventional testing procedures is limited, nevertheless, and the greater part of the variability among individuals in quality of performance remains to be accounted for. In academic achievement in college, to take an example from a field in which a vast amount of work has been done, about two thirds of the variance in freshman performance is left out of the prediction formula when the best measures of scholastic aptitude are used in combination with high-school grades. Our best predictions are thus none too good. The results of innumerable attempts to improve the efficiency of prediction, moreover, strongly indicate that conventional attempts to predict achievement have reached a "plateau," a ceiling that can be superseded only by new approaches.

It is generally agreed that academic achievement, on which so much attention has been focused, is itself only loosely related to success in the many walks of life for which a college degree is more and more frequently

required. Whatever it takes to produce a scientist, an effective government administrator, a business leader, or creative artist, "brains" and special aptitudes are not the only elements. As the increasing demands for highly trained specialists compel social scientists and administrators to attend more closely to the finite pool of high-level talent on which America can draw,¹ the importance of learning more about the "nonintellective" determinants of achievement becomes clear. Whether one is concerned with identifying potential talent for specialized training or with developing it through appropriate teaching and guidance, one encounters the need for better understanding of these neglected factors that fall within the province of the sociologist and of the psychological student of motivation and personality. The sociologist is equipped to investigate the role of sociocultural factors both in setting the individual on the road to achievement and in defining the social situations that will favor achievement. The student of personality, on the other hand, can bring his resources to bear directly on the emergent motives and other personal characteristics that affect the individual's use of his abilities.

Considerations such as these led early in 1951 to appointment by the Council of a Committee on Identification of Talent, for whose work support was provided by the John and Mary R. Markle Foundation.² In keeping with the need for inventiveness seen by the committee as essential for any gain in knowledge concerning the

¹ See Dael Wolfe, "Plans for Studies of America's Trained Talent," *Items*, March 1951, pp. 1-6.

² Members of the committee are David C. McClelland (chairman), Alfred L. Baldwin, Urie Bronfenbrenner, Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., Fred L. Strodbeck, and Dael Wolfe.

identification and use of talent, the committee embarked on a program of exploratory research. The studies undertaken were aimed at theoretical progress and methodological innovation, and represented a gamble that basic research in this underdeveloped area would in the long run yield results of both theoretical and practical value.

ORGANIZATION OF THE CONFERENCE

Discussions by the committee during 1951-52 pointed to the desirability not only of promoting better communication among the growing number of social scientists sharing this direction of research interest, but of bringing them together with individuals actively concerned with the problems of selection of personnel in various programs. During the fall of 1952, therefore, plans were laid for a small Conference on Nonintellective Determinants of Achievement to be held in Princeton on April 17-19, 1953. The objectives were described as follows: "The purpose of the conference is to provoke discussion of both sociocultural and personality determinants of achievement, bringing together persons active in research and theory development relevant to the topic and persons concerned with applied problems of talent selection. To facilitate a full and leisurely discussion of the talent problem, the number of participants is being kept small, and not more than one invited paper is being scheduled for each morning or afternoon."

Henry Chauncey of the Educational Testing Service served as chairman, and nine persons in addition to the members of the committee agreed to participate.³ The small size of the conference precluded any attempt at inclusive representation of significant research or selection programs. The participants, it was thought, would be interested in each other's work, and out of the discussion some fresh perspectives on the identification and development of talent might be gained. At the very least, those whose work had mutual relevance would have opportunity to learn about each other's working assumptions, modes of attack, and views on research strategy. The lively discussions that ensued, which characteristically outran the time limits of the scheduled program, together with later comments indicate that the conference seemed successful to the participants.

The invited papers, which with one exception were prepared and circulated to participants well before the

conference, were intended to supply a common ground from which discussion could proceed, and to provide a sampling of research as a basis for consideration of more general issues of research strategy. The subjects of the papers and their authors were: *Some Personality and Social Factors That Affect Academic Achievement*, by Frederick F. Stephan; *The Construction of Practical Assessment Techniques for the Early Identification of High-level Talent*, by Harrison G. Gough; *Person and Relationship as Determinants of Social Sensitivity (Empathy)*, by Paul Dempsey and Urie Bronfenbrenner (presented by Mr. Bronfenbrenner); *Social Mobility of Boys in the Boston Metropolitan Area*, by Samuel A. Stouffer; *Implications of the Study of Family Interaction for the Understanding of Achievement*, by Fred L. Strodtbeck.

Thus the subjects ranged from personality to sociocultural determinants and from academic achievement to social talents not conventionally considered by the personnel psychologist. Since most of the papers were essentially preliminary progress reports of research under way and in any case exceedingly heterogeneous in content and approach, there are no plans for joint publication of the conference proceedings. A brief characterization of each paper should nevertheless be helpful as background for an attempt to draw together some of the salient issues and perspectives that emerged in the discussion. The remainder of the present report will be devoted to such an interpretative summary. Since the conference made no attempt to formalize consensus and the participants have not passed judgment on this statement, they should be absolved of responsibility for an attempted orderliness that belies the way in which the conference proceeded, and may not fully represent the intricacies of its subject matter as well.

PERSONAL DETERMINANTS

The conference first considered a paper that sought to make new headway in the well-worked area of predicting academic achievement in college. Stephan reported preliminary findings on an aspect of the Study of Education at Princeton, which is under his direction. Following a selected small group of students through their college careers, Stephan and his colleagues thought they could distinguish, by essentially clinical methods, two fundamental dimensions that are especially important for the analysis of academic achievement. One is an index of college adjustment, based on ratings of degree of involvement in the academic tradition, depth of interpersonal relations with peers, and degree of genuine self-acceptance. The second is an empirically derived dimension related to the extent to which the

³ In addition to the chairman and members of the committee, the participants were: Lee J. Cronbach, University of Illinois; Henry S. Dyer, College Entrance Examination Board; Nelson N. Foote, University of Chicago; Harrison G. Gough, University of California; R. Nevitt Sanford, Vassar College; John M. Stalnaker, Association of American Medical Colleges; Frederick F. Stephan, Princeton University; Samuel A. Stouffer, Harvard University; and Calvin W. Taylor, National Research Council.

individual is dominated by the outer world or by inner impulse, or is in conflict between these two tendencies. In combination the two variables produce a typology in which, to be sure, the lines of separation between categories are arbitrarily drawn. At the poorly adjusted pole, there are the "cautious" or "submissive constrictive" individuals who appear to have a very meager inner life, the "conscientious" or "aggressive constrictive" students who appear to be involved in conflicting attitudes toward themselves, and the "individualistic" or "invasive" students who show spontaneity at the cost of stability. Toward the highly adjusted pole, these differences are less sharply drawn. Students falling in the highly adjusted range were grouped into an "independent" or "integrative" category. This classification, admittedly preliminary and impressionistic, appeared to be related not only to academic grades but to a variety of other measures. Work is in progress on the development of objective questionnaire methods to replace the clinical ratings hitherto employed.

Gough's paper and oral presentation drew on extensive experience with the use of objective personality questionnaires composed of heterogeneous items that have been found to discriminate between persons whose position is high or low in terms of some behavioral criterion. Taking academic grades as a criterion, Gough has constructed such scales for predicting academic achievement at the high school, college, and graduate student levels. Although the three scales were derived from an original common pool of items, they turned out to vary considerably in content, a fact to which Gough drew attention in advocating the desirability of breaking down the criterion (here, academic success) into its relevant temporal phases (here, high school, college, and graduate school). Academic achievement, in other words, is a different thing, and enters into different relationships, at the different levels in an academic career. Analogous considerations enter into the prediction of success in any career sequence in which the earlier stages form prerequisites for the later ones. Some issues raised by Gough in regard to the strategy of the "criterion oriented" research that his work exemplifies will be noted below.

SOCIAL AND SITUATIONAL FACTORS

On the second day of the conference the focus shifted from personal determinants of achievement to social and situational factors. Bronfenbrenner's studies of social sensitivity or empathy, which are being carried on under the auspices of the Committee on Identification of Talent, represent an exploratory attempt to deal with both personal and interpersonal sources of variation in a

single experimental design. It is Bronfenbrenner's working assumption that social sensitivity, defined as "differential reaction or response consistent with differences in the social stimulus situation," is an element in the social skills that underlie a number of forms of achievement that are important for society. This concept is also of theoretical importance in the increasingly prevalent approaches to social psychology that start from the analysis of interaction and interpersonal communication.

The experiment reported in his paper was devised to obtain measures of sensitivity to feelings occurring within a realistic situation in which the subjects would become genuinely involved, namely, one in which pairs of subjects interviewed each other for the stated purpose of assessing their individual qualifications for employment as interviewers in a community study. While Bronfenbrenner reported provocative results—for example, substantial differences in sensitivity characterizing not only particular persons but also particular interacting pairs, and different types of sensitivity—much of the significance of his study lies in its proposals for the experimental design of research, and for statistical analysis of data, on an inherently interactional problem bridging the traditional concerns of psychology and sociology. Plans were reported for extending the study of sensitivity over a broader range of experimental situations, linking its measurement to more accessible psychological indices, and investigating its implications for social participation and achievement in a community.

Stouffer drew on a study of social mobility among boys in public high schools in the Boston metropolitan area, on which he and his associates are currently engaged. Since a college education is the gateway to the majority of specialized careers, effective guidance depends on knowledge of the circumstances that keep the student on the relatively straight and narrow path leading to college, of those that lead him to stray from it, and of the timing of the points at which he makes the choices that determine the extent and nature of his education. Of particular interest are students of lower socioeconomic status who make high scores on measures of intelligence. Only a minority of these students, potentially college material, actually reach the college level. From an analysis of the social background and educational history of students in this problematic group Stouffer has concluded that straying from the path to college occurs at all precollege stages, without "bunching" at any one discernible crucial point. Furthermore, with the exception that differences in intelligence test scores within the brighter group seem to be associated with early defections, Stouffer and his colleagues have so far been unable to identify important factors that differentiate between those who "go astray" early and

late in their public school careers. Stouffer emphasized the need for more extensive data than are currently available to permit the many interrelated factors to be disentangled, as well as the need for more adequate information about the sequence of "choice-points" and what happens at them if guidance is to be oriented to the immediate decisions that the student has to make.

Social and cultural factors that were dealt with in the gross in Stouffer's statistical studies came under more microscopic scrutiny in Strodbeck's direct investigation of family interaction. Starting with the observation that children of Jewish cultural origin are more likely to hold themselves to goals of high achievement than children of Italian origin, Strodbeck is recording and analyzing the interaction patterns of father, mother, and son in matched families from the two groups, as they attempt to resolve disagreements involving different "coalitions" within the family. He has devised a technique for analyzing transcriptions of recorded discussions that reveals the extent to which each of the three interacting members on the one hand dominates the agreements reached by the family, and on the other hand participates in the discussion through which decisions are reached. It is his hypothesis that high motivation toward achievement in the son is fostered by an interaction pattern in which the parents tend to some extent to dominate the decisions but the child is rewarded by a somewhat larger share of participation. As part of a larger study of cultural factors in talent development, which Strodbeck is directing under the auspices of the committee, this investigation is focused on the processes by which cultural attitudes toward achievement are transmitted. In the long run, therefore, it may bear fruit in suggestions for social practice.

PERSON AND SITUATION

Discussion in the first five sessions of the conference hewed fairly closely to the research problems treated in the papers, while the final session, designated for free discussion, actually tended to center on the complementary problems of practical selection. In one sense, therefore, the gap between exploratory research and applied practice was never bridged. Nevertheless, themes that seemed to have common relevance to the work of the participants recurrently emerged throughout the conference. Among these was the need to keep both the person and his situation in joint focus if the determinants or conditions of high achievement are to be identified. The usual one-sided views of both psychologists and sociologists thus need explicit correction.

The development of techniques for measuring the capacities and dispositions of the person, it was observed,

has far outrun our ability to analyze the institutional setting in which he must strive to make his mark. Job analysis, to be sure, has sought to itemize the particular activities and skills required in a position as a step toward appropriate selection. But the restrictions and demands imposed on occupational roles by the broader institutional setting have been neglected. If becoming a physician, as one of the participants speculated, requires a highly developed capacity to renounce immediate gratifications, this has implications not only for selecting and advising premedical students but for attempts to reconstruct the medical curriculum as well. And if, as seemed likely, such broad professional categories as doctor, lawyer, and engineer each contain a variety of roles—of different roads to success that impose different demands and offer different opportunities to their incumbents—this too needs to be taken into account if the student in training, who cannot be expected to know all these things, is to be given a better chance of finding the best niche for himself.

To specify the institutional features of the major careers would be a formidable task. Rather than getting lost in a morass of specifics, it was proposed that research should attempt to outline a typology of situations, a set of dimensions in terms of which descriptions of the social setting of performance might be organized. On the other hand, data presented by Gough suggested that there may be considerable similarity among the optimal personality characteristics required for various high-level careers. To the extent that personality measures that have as wide predictive relevance as "intelligence" can be developed, advances may be possible without taking the situation explicitly into account.

Not only is the situation related to the ultimate criterion of success, but better prediction may perhaps be anticipated if the personal characteristics on which it is based are not artificially abstracted from the situations in which they are manifested. Bronfenbrenner and Strodbeck regard their work as approaching in different ways this complex problem of linking behavioral indices to the interpersonal situation. It is perhaps possible to envision, at a stage still remote for practical purposes, rational prediction from measures of a person in a situation at Time₁ to similarly analyzed criteria of behavior of the person-in-situation at Time₂.

Discussion at the conference generally took for granted that, in the long run, promise of exceptional achievement can best be identified through measures built on a theoretically articulate understanding of its determinants. From this perspective it was agreed that personal and situational measures should be kept distinct and not thrown together in "blind" empirical prediction formulas. On the other hand, the need for better theoretical

models to combine data on person and situation for purposes of prediction was recognized.

PROBLEMS OF RESEARCH STRATEGY

The variety of approaches illustrated in the papers presented to the conference provided opportunity for considering several alternative, perhaps complementary, strategies in research on the identification of talent that are relevant to an even broader range of problems.

The frontal attack on the task of prediction is through research directly oriented toward a *criterion*, as exemplified in Gough's work. Here, the ultimate goal of prediction is never lost from sight. In terms of some direct measure or estimate of what is to be predicted, predictive items are assembled and culled inductively, guided to be sure by the research worker's hunches and hypotheses about what is relevant. Theoretical clarification and greater predictive efficiency is sought through statistical analysis of the empirically derived predictors.

Gough's paper had made several recommendations for increasing the efficiency of this sort of research, among them a proposal for "sequential testing." According to this plan, a scale is first developed and administered for a tentative sorting of "sheep" and "goats." Corrective scales are then developed for a more refined screening of these subgroups: one to cull as many as possible of the real "goats" from the group initially scoring as "sheep," and another to identify real "sheep" among those with initial "goat"-like scores. Problems arise in this kind of research when the criterion being investigated seems inherently vague, as is not infrequently the case. But Gough presented evidence that even in such instances it is possible to work quite effectively from judges' ratings or their equivalent.

In contrast with the empiricism of this strategy is an approach that is oriented rather toward *variables*, represented at the conference by Bronfenbrenner's report. In his project efforts are focused on isolating and clarifying experimentally a social-psychological variable—social sensitivity—that is thought to be related to aspects of achievement. With the ultimate criterion of achievement left temporarily in the background, the question is asked experimentally, "Does sensitivity as defined behave like a unitary variable?" Only when the nature of the variable has been clarified does the investigator look for correlates that can be employed as predictors and for the relation of the particular variable to performance and achievement in the community. Less emphatically inductive than the strategy that focuses on the criterion, this approach places more stress on the testing of theoretically derived hypotheses. Its proponents may feel that the former is insufficiently guided by theory to contribute

as much as it might to theoretical understanding. On the other hand, those concerned primarily with the criterion may charge the latter with impracticality; as one participant remarked at the conference in another connection, "There are other ways of studying gravity than watching an elephant slide down a grassy bank." Meanwhile, investigators with the more theoretical orientation may maintain that working through an intricate experimental design forces the clarification of theoretical ambiguities by requiring explicit decision on them.

Another choice of strategy pointed up by the papers lies between the extensive survey and the more sharply focused study of a smaller sample. Stouffer's work dramatized the large number of cases necessary for disentangling relationships when many variables are relevant. According to one view, an extensive survey is a prerequisite for attempts to define critical categories of individuals for more intensive study. The alternative view was that prior theoretical analysis could identify these crucial categories and eliminate the need for an extensive survey.

A final strategic problem with broad implications concerned the way in which qualitative or "clinical" insights should be drawn on in research. An example of a clinical approach had been provided by Stephan. In moving toward the related goals of validated theoretical understanding and predictive power, should the "clinician" be encouraged to use quantitative methods; or should there be a division of labor in which the experimentalist uses him as an informant and tries to make explicit the basis of his intuitive judgments? No resolution of this perennial problem was attempted, but it was agreed that progress should come from clarification of "blind" relationships wherever they are found. In research that is oriented toward a criterion, for example, the predictive item for which there is no rationale poses a problem whose solution has practical as well as theoretical value. It is the same with the global clinical impression. Even when it predicts a criterion more effectively than available objective measures, practical efficiency is advanced to the extent that impressions can be replaced by objective techniques. Theory, too, stands to gain as implicit grounds of judgment are made explicit and therefore accessible to independent verification.

GOALS OF TALENT CONSERVATION

Once determined, the criterion often does not remain stable, as it should if human affairs were arranged for the convenience of selectors and predictors. Society changes. By the time today's applicants for prolonged professional training are making their way in the world, the opportunities and requirements of their work may differ considerably from those taken into account in selections

made in 1953. This problem of the "galloping criterion" obviously sets a limit on the feasibility of highly specific selection programs. Starting from a primary concern with problems of the identification and selection of talent, the discussion moved toward an emphasis on guidance, and the research and practical needs of guidance programs if they are to become effective. The shift in frame of reference was sufficiently noticeable that after a particularly cogent exposition of the latter point of view, one participant remarked, "Right speech, wrong conference." Yet within a broader context of conservation, selection and guidance are equally pertinent.

The fact that the criterion has a time dimension introduces another complication. Traditions of professional training may lag behind the special situations in which the training is to be put into practice. It is therefore entirely possible that persons selected in terms of a criterion of probable success in professional training may not be the ones best equipped for the actual practice of their specialty. Recognition of this possibility led to the posing of several alternatives, among which there was no general agreement. Some, mindful of the commitments of on-going selection programs, favored continued attempts at a tactical compromise while the strategic problems of the goals of selection are being re-examined. Others made more radical suggestions: on the one hand, to forget about the criterion problem and select high-level talent generally, letting the person find his niche; on the other, to declare a moratorium on selection until more adequate analyses of the process of talent development and of the criterion situation are available.

Where the criterion is both stable and reasonably specific, and there is an ample pool of applicants, everyone agreed, selection is both desirable and feasible. In spite of differences of opinion about the extent to which this state of affairs prevails and the appropriate strategy when it does not, there was general agreement that much more attention to the guidance and development of high-level talent is needed. Rigorous selection is, in fact, a luxury that a rapidly expanding academic and professional economy can ill afford when there is actually a scarcity of applicants for most specialized careers. In such a situation of scarcity the most highly endowed present no problem. The problematic group, it was held, are rather the good, above average students whose success in college and career depends crucially on their pursuing realistic objectives with adequate drive. From this view, the greatest waste occurs within this relatively well-endowed pool of talent from which too often individuals are not entering the careers for which they are best suited by personality. The prescription would call for more appropriate use of existing talent, rather than raising the "cutting point" separating the selected from

the rejected. Ideally, the student should be confronted with an environment that shows him differentiated possibilities and encourages him to select progressively the roles that he finds most rewarding. Too often, it was suggested, the present routines of higher and professional education thwart this process of self-exploration. The student finds himself placed in a standardized curriculum that, geared to an occupational or professional stereotype, belies the variety of roles that are available within the conventional categories of careers and fails to provide him with opportunities for experimentation. Opportunities for developing a differentiated view of role possibilities occur more often than not by chance.

Seen from this perspective, the important problem becomes more one of teaching than of selection. A different approach to guidance is indicated, encouraging the student progressively to differentiate his goals in relation to social reality, his motives, and his talents. Self-exploration can be abetted by techniques for making the insights of others available to the student and instruments for promoting self-evaluation. The kind of institutional analysis suggested earlier is clearly relevant. To help the student in self-appraisal, multidimensional instruments that are neither threatening nor obscure to him also have much to recommend them.

Rather than aiming at long-range prediction of an elusive ultimate criterion, such instruments would be concerned mainly with short-range prediction, that is, with clarifying the nature of the student's existing motives and capacities as they relate to the choices that immediately confront him. Essential to their development would be the fuller understanding of the sequence of "choice-points" in an educational career.

Some concern was voiced about the value implications of such an approach to the conservation of talent. Would it lead to a rigid homogeneity within professional categories and thus discard the safety value of adaptability provided by the present rather haphazard allocation of individuals to social roles? Does the emphasis on guidance and the nurturing of talent "spoil" the student for the rigors of real life? Or, contrariwise, does the emphasis on self-evaluation and self-direction provide a safeguard? Value problems lurked close to the surface, in fact, throughout the conference. The search for factors in talent development that can be manipulated was accompanied by a not always latent uneasiness about the ethics of social manipulation. Would we, if we could, want to produce a society of hard-driven achievers? Awareness of difficult and fundamental problems like these doubtless entered recurrently into the judgments expressed about research and social strategy. There seemed to be agreement, however, that exploration of these more ultimate issues would tax the capacities of other conferences.

FELLOWSHIPS, GRANTS, AND OTHER INDIVIDUAL APPOINTMENTS

AWARDS MADE IN 1953 AND RECENT TRENDS

Since January the Council committees in charge of fellowships, grants, and other individual awards have considered the qualifications of some 1,300 candidates and have recommended various appointments for about 200 persons whose names are listed on pages 20-24 *infra*. Stipends and honoraria amount in the aggregate to one third of a million dollars. The following table shows the number of awards in each category, with comparative figures for recent years:

	1953	1952	1951	1950
Faculty research fellowships	6	5	7	5
Research training fellowships	37	33	29	36
Area research training fellowships	12	40	32	27
Travel grants for area research	2	18	14	12
Grants-in-aid of research	25	31	29	25
Faculty research grants	†	9	18	†
Undergraduate research stipends:				
Students	41	•	•	•
Faculty supervisors	39	•	•	•
Admissions to summer institute in mathematics	43	•	•	•

† Not a continuing program.

• Program initiated in 1953.

Each of the several continuing fellowship and grant programs has been maintained this year on approximately the same scale as before, with the exception of the program of area fellowships and travel grants. The small balance remaining on hand from the grants for support of this program was sufficient for far fewer awards than in preceding years. A general review of the six years' operation of the program is planned for a later issue of *Items*.

Partly in order to compensate for the sharp curtailment of the area fellowship program, but mainly because an unusual number of very promising applicants appeared, the Committee on Social Science Personnel this year made a few more awards than usual. This increase, however, cannot be sustained in future years unless additional funds are secured, for the average fellowship stipend has risen sharply in recent years. The awards approved this spring entail a total commitment about 25 percent in excess of the average annual budget for research training fellowships.

No faculty research grants to liberal arts colleges were offered this year. These grants were financed by the Twentieth Century Fund in 1951 as an emergency measure in anticipation of radical reduction of male student enrollments following the Korean crisis.

The two new programs inaugurated this year, namely the summer institute in mathematics for social scientists and the program of undergraduate research stipends, were described in the March 1953 issue of *Items*, pages 7-9.

Applicants for admission to the summer institute in mathematics for social scientists, to be held at Dartmouth College, June 22 - August 14, 1953, numbered 234, of whom 43 have been enrolled. Students and instructors in the fields of sociology and psychology predominate among those

admitted, but the disciplines of political science, economics, and statistics are also represented. The curriculum is designed especially to prepare students to apply mathematical analysis to social science data and problems that have heretofore been treated in nonmathematical terms.

Faculty sponsors in 125 colleges and universities nominated 322 undergraduates as candidates for research stipends. Stipends have been offered to 41 students for research to be carried on under the guidance of 39 faculty members in 25 colleges and universities. In most cases a single student plans to work with one faculty member, but a few collective research enterprises are included among the awards. As in the case of the mathematics institute, the largest numbers of awards are to persons in departments of sociology and psychology. About half of the awards are distributed among other social science departments. In making its selections the committee was influenced by the nature of the research proposed and the evident qualifications of students and their supervisors, rather than by their departmental affiliations. Holders of undergraduate stipends will be eligible to compete for first-year graduate study fellowships, which will be awarded for the first time in 1954.

PLANS FOR 1954

It is expected that all of the types of awards made in 1953 will again be offered in the spring of 1954, with the exception of *area fellowships and travel grants* and the *summer institute in mathematics*. No funds are now available for continuation of the former program. Another summer institute in mathematics is to be announced later, but it has not yet been determined whether this will be held in 1954 or in a later year.

Continuing efforts are being made to secure more adequate funds for research training fellowships and grants-in-aid of research, but it is impossible at present to predict that these efforts will be fruitful. As already noted, discontinuance of the special fellowship program for training in research on foreign areas must be expected to lead to increased competition for the general research training fellowships, while rising costs of living reduce the number of fellowships that can be supported with a fixed budget. The grant-in-aid budget has remained fixed for many years at a level that completely excludes from consideration many desirable projects that cannot be attempted without larger grants than are now possible. In particular, the Council lacks any means of assisting scholars who reasonably require grants ranging from, say, \$2,000 to \$10,000 to enable them to take leave for periods of full-time research.

Plans call for the usual distribution early next autumn of a general announcement of fellowships, grants, and other awards to be offered in 1954. Interested persons are invited to ask that their names be placed on the mailing list. Requests should be addressed to the Council at 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

FACULTY RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS

At its meeting on March 30 the Committee on Faculty Research Fellowships—Blair Stewart (chairman), Paul W. Gates, Harold E. Jones, Donald G. Marquis, Dorothy S. Thomas, Schuyler C. Wallace, and Malcolm M. Willey—selected six fellows for three-year appointments beginning in the fall of 1953. With the cooperation of their respective institutions the fellows will be enabled to devote at least half of their time to their own research while carrying on reduced teaching schedules. The appointments follow:

- Robert Eisner, Assistant Professor of Economics, Northwestern University, for theoretical and empirical investigation of determinants of economic growth and underemployment and their interrelations.
- Rendigs Fels, Associate Professor of Economics, Vanderbilt University, for research on American business cycles between 1865 and 1914.
- James F. Short, Jr., Instructor in Sociology, State College of Washington, for investigation of the extent and nature of criminal behavior in conventionally and criminally oriented groups.
- Bernard J. Siegel, Associate Professor of Anthropology, Stanford University, for study of social stability and change in Portugal and Brazil, with special reference to social perception and motivation.
- Ralph H. Turner, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of California at Los Angeles, for research on social mobility and personal values.
- Lloyd Ulman, Associate Professor of Economics and Industrial Relations, University of Minnesota, for analysis of rules and practices of contemporary American trade unions.

RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS

The Committee on Social Science Personnel—Earl Latham (chairman), Ralph L. Beals, John A. Clausen, Richard A. Lester, John H. Rohrer, and Paul Webbink—met on March 23–24 and awarded 37 research training fellowships:

- Martin J. Bailey, Ph.D. candidate in political economy, Johns Hopkins University, for research in England on the general equilibrium foundations of monetary theory.
- Gary S. Becker, Ph.D. candidate in economics, University of Chicago, for study of nonpecuniary motivation, discrimination, and competition.
- Werner M. Blumenthal, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Princeton University, for research in Germany on labor-management cooperation in the German iron and steel industry, 1946–52.
- Donald L. Burkholder, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, University of Wisconsin, for training in mathematical statistics at the University of North Carolina.
- Robert K. Burns, Jr., Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Columbia University, for research in Savoie-Dauphiné on contemporary cultural relationships in a village.
- Ralph K. Davidson, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Johns Hopkins University, for research on price discrimination in the operating gas and electric utilities.
- Tom E. Davis, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Johns Hopkins University, for research in England on resource allocation in underdeveloped countries.

- William N. Dember, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, University of Michigan, for investigation of the nature of perceptual similarity through the use of scaling methods and the conditioned response.
- Irwin Deutscher, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, University of Missouri, for study of marital relationships in middle age.
- Douglas J. Doubleday, Ph.D. candidate in political science, University of California, Berkeley, for research on state legislative control of public expenditures.
- Paul R. Ducey, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Columbia University, for research in Scotland on social and economic problems in the Hebrides.
- Ernst Ekman, Ph.D. candidate in history, University of California at Los Angeles, for research in the Baltic-Scandinavian area on Prussia and the Northern Powers, 1537–1618.
- Susan M. Ervin, Ph.D. candidate in social psychology, University of Michigan, for training in linguistics and research on the verbal behavior of bilingual persons.
- Edwin Fogelman, Ph.D. candidate in political science, Princeton University, for research in England on human rights and modern constitutionalism.
- Julian H. Franklin, Ph.D. candidate in public law and government, Columbia University, for research on the formation of authoritarian political attitudes in periods of rapid social change.
- Thomas M. Gale, Ph.D. candidate in history, University of Pennsylvania, for research in Peru on the history of Lima, 1535–1600.
- Leo A. Goodman, Ph.D. in mathematics and mathematical statistics, Princeton University, Assistant Professor of Sociology and Statistics, University of Chicago, for research in Great Britain in statistics and sociology.
- Alan G. Gowman, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Harvard University, for research on the social role and societal marginality of the war blinded.
- Herbert G. Gutman, Ph.D. candidate in history, University of Wisconsin, for study of economic statistics and research on the depression of 1873–78 in selected industrial communities and areas.
- David G. Hays, Ph.D. candidate in social relations, Harvard University, for training and research in mathematical models for social relations.
- Christoph M. Heinicke, Ph.D. candidate in child psychology, Harvard University, postdoctoral fellowship for research in England on the development of young children and training in child psychotherapy.
- Gottfried O. Lang, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Cornell University, for research on self-directed culture change among the Ute Indians.
- Ralph A. Luebben, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Cornell University, for field investigation of the cultural, economic, and social behavior of Navaho Indians in a Colorado mining community.
- Frank J. Munger, Ph.D. candidate in political science, Harvard University, for research on political party competition in Indiana.
- Manning Nash, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, University of Chicago, for a study of the accommodation of Indians in a Guatemalan village to factory work.
- Jiri Nehnevajsa, Ph.D. in sociology, University of Zurich, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Colorado, for further training in mathematical statistics.
- R. William Pfouts, Ph.D. in economics and Acting Associate Professor of Economics, University of North Caro-

lina, for research in England to test empirically certain hypotheses in welfare economics.

Fletcher E. Riggs, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Vanderbilt University, for research on economic aspects of the allocation and use of resources in Southern agriculture.

Charles E. Rollins, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Stanford University, for research in Bolivia, Chile, and Venezuela on economic development, with particular reference to mineral resources.

John T. Saywell, Ph.D. candidate in history, Harvard University, for study in Canada of the provincial lieutenant-governorship.

Leo F. Schnore, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, University of Michigan, for ecological analysis of population change in metropolitan satellites in the United States.

Harold M. Schroder, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, Ohio State University, for application of social learning theory concerning expectancy and reinforcement value in the study of social attitudes.

J. E. Keith Smith, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, University of Michigan, for research on the process of learning to predict events whose probability is constant or variable.

Robert C. Toole, Ph.D. candidate in history, University of Pennsylvania, for research on the history of journalism in Norristown, Pennsylvania, 1900-1952.

Eugene A. Weinstein, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Northwestern University, for research on the development of children's awareness of social status.

Solomon Weinstock, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, Indiana University, postdoctoral fellowship for research on the role of reward in the acquisition and retention of a learned habit.

Viktor Zarnowitz, Ph.D. in economics, University of Heidelberg, for further study and for research on stability of high employment.

AREA RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS AND TRAVEL GRANTS

At its meeting on March 25-26 the Committee on Area Research Training Fellowships—Richard Hartshorne (chairman), C. E. Black, W. Rex Crawford, Cora Du Bois, and Henry C. Wallich—awarded 12 fellowships:

Victor F. Ayoub, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Harvard University, for research in Lebanon or Syria on the locus of power and authority in a village.

Abraham S. Becker, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Columbia University, for research in the United States on the cotton textile industry in the Soviet Union.

Robert N. Bellah, Ph.D. candidate in sociology and Far Eastern languages, Harvard University, for research in the United States on values, social structure, and economic motivation in early modern China and Japan.

Sidney Heitman, Ph.D. candidate in history, Columbia University, for research in the United States on the social philosophy of Nikolai Bukharin.

John T. Hitchcock, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Cornell University, for research in India on effects of industrialism on a tribal group.

W. David Hopper, Ph.D. candidate in agricultural economics, Cornell University, for research in North Central India on the economy of a village.

Lewis Levine, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Columbia University, for study in the South Asia Regional Studies Department at the University of Pennsylvania.

J. Gus Liebenow, Jr., Ph.D. candidate in political science, Northwestern University, for research in British East Africa on direct and indirect rule.

Gene E. Martin, Ph.D. candidate in geography, Syracuse University, for research in Central America and Chile on land redistribution.

Councill Taylor, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Yale University, for research in Sierra Leone Colony, West Africa, on a stratified Negro community.

Peter N. Vukasin, Ph.D. in economics, University of California, for research in Yugoslavia on the growth of industry and the development of industrial labor.

Donald E. Wilmott, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Cornell University, for research in Indonesia on the family system of a Chinese community.

Travel grants for area research were awarded to the following scholars:

Samuel E. Martin, Assistant Professor of Japanese and Korean, Yale University, for ethnolinguistic research in Japan, Korea, Formosa, Hongkong, and the Ryukyus.

Benjamin Schwartz, Assistant Professor of History, Harvard University, for research in Japan on intellectual development of modern China from the end of the 19th century until the Communist assumption of power.

GRANTS-IN-AID

At its annual meeting on March 16 the Committee on Grants-in-Aid—George W. Stocking (chairman), Ray A. Billington, Richard S. Crutchfield, John W. Riley, Jr., and Amry Vandenbosch—made awards to 25 scholars in support of their individual research projects:

O. Fritiof Ander, Professor of History, Augustana College, Illinois, for completion of research on Swedish immigration and Swedish immigrants in the United States.

Robert G. Athearn, Assistant Professor of History, University of Colorado, for research on W. T. Sherman and the American frontier, 1865-83.

John F. Cady, Professor of History, Ohio University, for research on the political history of Burma in the twentieth century.

Frederica de Laguna, Associate Professor of Anthropology, Bryn Mawr College, for ethnological and historical research in Alaska on the Tlingit Indians of Yakutat.

W. Clement Eaton, Professor of History, University of Kentucky, for research on the cultural history of the South, 1790-1860.

Arvel B. Erickson, Professor of History, Western Reserve University, for research in England on the public career of Edward T. Cardwell.

Joe B. Frantz, Assistant Professor of History, University of Texas, for a history of McKinney and Williams, the first mercantile house in Texas.

Maurice F. Freehill, Professor of Psychology and Education, Western Washington College of Education, for research on performance bias as a measure of attitude.

Walter R. Goldschmidt, Associate Professor of Anthropology and Sociology, University of California at Los Angeles, for research on the theory of social organization.

Albert H. Hastorf, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Dartmouth College, for a study of generalized social sensitivity (empathy).

Francis H. Heller, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Kansas, for research in Kansas on two-party competition in local elections. This award was designated as a memorial to Julius Turner who died in 1952 before completing research on a related topic with the aid of a grant from the Council.

Mozell C. Hill, Professor of Sociology, Atlanta University, for research on techniques of measurement of social stratification.

Bert J. Loewenberg, Professor of American History, Sarah Lawrence College, for research in England on the life of Charles Darwin and the influence of Darwinian evolution on western thought.

James A. Maxwell, Professor of Economics, Clark University, for research on the techniques and institutional setting of fiscal policy.

Edmund A. Moore, Professor of History, University of Connecticut, for research on the church-state issue in the 1928 presidential campaign in the United States.

Charles Morley, Associate Professor of History, Ohio State University, for research in France and England on democracy and dictatorship in Poland since 1918.

Earl H. Pritchard, Associate Professor of Far Eastern History, University of Chicago, for research in Europe on British and Anglo-Indian contacts with China prior to 1842.

Oliver H. Radkey, Associate Professor of History, University of Texas, for research on the vanquished foes of Bolshevism: the Socialist Revolutionary Party in Russia.

S. Oliver Roberts, Professor of Psychology and Education, Fisk University, for research on the relation of sex, race, and social background to the Thematic Apperception Test reactions of 10-year-old children in Southern cities.

James M. Sakoda, Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of Connecticut, for the application of analysis of variance in the study of individual differences in psychological experiments.

Morris Siegel, Economic Affairs Officer, United Nations, for a study in Guatemala of cultural change.

George W. Smith, Associate Professor of History, University of New Mexico, for research on Northern economic interests and the South, 1861-65, and the impact of the Civil War on Northern society.

James M. Smith, Instructor in History, Ohio State University, for research on the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions and other opposition to the Alien and Sedition Laws.

Watt Stewart, Professor of History, State University of New York, Teachers College, Albany, for research in Guatemala, El Salvador, and Costa Rica on Minor C. Keith and railroads and the banana trade.

William R. Willoughby, Associate Professor of History and Government, St. Lawrence University, for research on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH STIPENDS

At its meeting on April 25-26 the Committee on Undergraduate Research Training—Douglas McGregor (chairman), R. F. Arragon, E. Adamson Hoebel, Robert B. Mac-

Leod, Albert J. Reiss, Jr., and George E. Simpson—offered research stipends to 41 students, and designated supervisors, as follows:

William H. Mills and David J. Peterson; supervisor, Donald S. Strong, Professor of Political Science, University of Alabama; research on factors affecting decision making by Alabama legislators.

Esther Gordon, Roberta Messner, Esther Newcomb, and Sally Pinkerton; supervisor, Alvin W. Gouldner, Associate Professor of Sociology, Antioch College; research on the perception of group structure and functions by group members.

Norris A. Magnuson; supervisor, David O. Moberg, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Bethel College, St. Paul, Minnesota; study of the effectiveness of religious conversions.

Raoul Freeman; supervisor, Edward Marcus, Assistant Professor of Economics, Brooklyn College; investigation of the behavior patterns of selected holders of U.S. Savings Bonds.

Gerald A. Fox; supervisor, David G. Farrelly, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of California at Los Angeles; research on the discrepancy between party registration and voting in California.

Richard P. Kluckhohn, University of Chicago, and Ariane Brunel, Barnard College; supervisor, Sol Tax, Professor of Anthropology, University of Chicago; research on the interrelations between an Iowa Fox Indian community and the surrounding white society.

Elinor Stoneman; supervisor, Bernard G. Rosenthal, Assistant Professor and Research Associate, Division of the Social Sciences, University of Chicago; research on integration in an interracial housing project.

Marvin Gelfand; supervisor, Robert L. Raimon, Assistant Professor of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University; research on apprenticeship in the training of skilled industrial workers.

Jay C. Greenfield; supervisors, Robin M. Williams, Jr., Professor of Sociology, and Morris Rosenberg, Social Science Research Council Research Training Fellow, Cornell University; research on the determinants of political interest and apathy among college students.

Jeanne Erard, Radcliffe College; supervisors, Gardner Lindzey, Assistant Professor of Psychology, and George Klein, Visiting Lecturer on Social Psychology, Harvard University; research on the relation between different types of cognitive organization and the expression of motivational states.

Eric Klinger; supervisor, Renato Tagiuri, Lecturer in Clinical Psychology, Harvard University; research on ascendancy-submission and similarity of attitudes in friends.

Richard D. Mann, Jr.; supervisor, Robert F. Bales, Lecturer in Sociology and Research Associate, Harvard University; research on role differentiation in experimental groups.

Calvert W. Watkins; supervisor, Joshua Whatmough, Professor of Comparative Philology, Harvard University; research on language and culture in ancient Gaul.

David B. Eyde; supervisors, Leonard E. Mason, Associate Professor of Anthropology, and Douglas S. Yamamura, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Hawaii; study of recent American Samoan migrants to Hawaii.

Elliott B. Barnett and Karl A. Gabler; supervisors, Rocco J. Tresolini, Assistant Professor of Political Science, and

- Richard W. Taylor, Instructor in Political Science, Lehigh University; research on the extent and social implications of arrest without warrant.
- Witold L. Cohn; supervisor, Sayre P. Schatz, Assistant Professor of Economics, Lincoln University; study of pricing and marketing behavior of produce merchants in the weekly Tattersall market.
- Marta Mapes; supervisor, Sidney Schoeffler, Assistant Professor of Economics, University of Massachusetts; study of the role of a local Chamber of Commerce.
- Joan A. Kolberg; supervisor, Dale Yoder, Professor of Economics and Industrial Relations, University of Minnesota; development and testing of a scale of consensus as a measure of communication.
- Jerome H. Sacks; supervisor, Wallace A. Russell, Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of Minnesota; research on associative factors in verbal behavior.
- Ronald M. Schneider; supervisor, George I. Blanksten, Associate Professor of Political Science, Northwestern University; research on the role of Latin-American delegations in the United Nations.
- Frederic Mosher; supervisor, J. Milton Yinger, Professor of Sociology and Anthropology, Oberlin College; study of social and cultural change in the Tennessee Valley Authority area.
- George W. Beatty; supervisor, Charles G. Sellers, Jr., Instructor in History, Princeton University; investigation of the background and causes of the Detroit race riot of 1943.
- Mary L. Eysenbach; supervisors, Arthur H. Leigh, Associate Professor of Economics, and Seymour Fiekowsky, Assistant Professor of Economics, Reed College; study of interest groups and their behavior under the Oregon milk marketing law.
- J. Robert Wallace; supervisor, David H. French, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Reed College; study of the personality development of Sahaptin Indian children.
- Dean C. Taylor and Lawrence N. Yonemura; supervisor, Alexander Vucinich, Assistant Professor of Sociology, San Jose State College; study of Japanese "strawberry communities" in the Santa Clara Valley.
- Janice G. Bernstein; supervisor, Helen M. Lynd, Social Science Department, Sarah Lawrence College; research on concepts of the healthy personality in various schools of psychology.
- Peter B. Bart and Milton Cummings, Jr.; supervisor, Paul N. Ylvisaker, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Swarthmore College; an analysis of voting behavior in Philadelphia in the presidential election of 1952.
- Eric Gillett; supervisor, Henry Gleitman, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Swarthmore College; research on the role of selected factors in incidental and intentional learning.
- Norma Schilling; supervisors, David B. Carpenter, Associate Professor of Sociology, and David W. Salmon, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Washington University; voting behavior of middle-income groups in the presidential elections of 1944-52 in St. Louis.
- Carol Klapprodt; supervisor, Albert J. Mayer, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Wayne University; demographic analysis of birth rates in Detroit.
- Barbara J. Staner; supervisor, David T. Herman, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Wichita; study of group influences upon perception of relatively unstructured stimuli.
- Donald L. Noel; supervisor, Marshall B. Clinard, Professor of Sociology, University of Wisconsin; research on differences in role playing among Negroes from segregated and nonsegregated colleges.
- Jo Ann H. Saari; supervisor, Rondo E. Cameron, Assistant Professor of Economics and History, University of Wisconsin; research on the formation of the Italian business elite, 1860-1900.

1953 SUMMER INSTITUTE IN MATHEMATICS

At the invitation of the Committee on Mathematical Training of Social Scientists—William G. Madow (chairman), E. P. Hutchinson, Jacob Marschak, Paul E. Meehl, George A. Miller, Frederick Mosteller, and Robert M. Thrall—the following 43 students will attend the 1953 institute:

- Daniel E. Berlyne, Teacher of Psychology, Brooklyn College.
- Elinor S. Brush, graduate student in psychology, Radcliffe Graduate School.
- F. Robert Brush, graduate student in psychology, Harvard University.
- Richard Christie, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Social Psychology, New York University.
- Michael R. D'Amato, graduate student in psychology, New York University.
- Otis Dudley Duncan, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Chicago.
- Hyman H. Frankel, graduate student in sociology, University of Illinois.
- William G. Franklin, graduate student in psychology, University of Minnesota.
- Eugene H. Galanter, graduate student in psychology, University of Pennsylvania.
- Murray Glanzer, Ph.D., Instructor in Psychology, Brooklyn College.
- Gerald Gratch, graduate student in psychology, University of Chicago.
- William Hamburger, Ph.D., Instructor in Economics, Stanford University.
- William L. Hays, graduate student in psychology, University of Michigan.
- Siegfried A. Hoermann, Survey Statistician, U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- Edward D. Kalachek, graduate student in economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Georg Karlsson, Ph.D., Visiting Lecturer, Scandinavian Area Studies, University of Wisconsin.
- Bertram P. Karon, graduate student in psychology, Princeton University.
- Howard H. Kendler, Ph.D., Professor of Psychology, New York University.
- Evelyn M. Kitagawa, Ph.D., Research Associate in Sociology, University of Chicago.
- Anthony Koo, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Economics, Michigan State College.
- Joel Levy, graduate student in economics, Columbia University.
- Charles E. Lindblom, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Economics, Yale University.
- Gardner Lindzey, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Psychology, Harvard University.
- Alisa S. Lourie, graduate student in sociology, Columbia University.

James G. March, Ph.D., Social Science Research Council Fellow in political science, Yale University.
 Martin U. Martel, graduate student in sociology, Cornell University.
 Theodore M. Mills, Ph.D., Lecturer in Sociology, Harvard University.
 Paul M. Neurath, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Sociology and Statistics, Queens College.
 Donald W. Olmsted, graduate student in sociology, University of Minnesota.
 Lloyd R. Peterson, graduate student in psychology, University of Minnesota.
 Stanley S. Pliskoff, graduate student in psychology, New York University.
 Bertram H. Raven, Ph.D., Research Associate in Group Dynamics, University of Michigan.
 Stephen A. Richardson, graduate student in human relations, Cornell University.
 Henry W. Riecken, Jr., Ph.D., Lecturer in Social Psychology, Harvard University.
 Ruth Riemer, Acting Instructor in Sociology, University of California at Los Angeles.
 Robert I. Rosenthal, graduate student in psychology, University of Chicago.
 Earl S. Schaefer, graduate student in psychology, Catholic University of America.
 Eli Shapiro, Ph.D., Professor of Finance, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
 Herbert A. Shepard, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Sociology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
 Ralph H. Smuckler, Ph.D., Instructor in Political Science, Michigan State College.
 Walter A. Spivey, graduate student in economics, University of North Carolina.
 Percy H. Tannenbaum, graduate student in psychology, University of Illinois.
 John C. Wahlke, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Political Science, Amherst College.

FULBRIGHT PROGRAMS

The Committee on International Exchange of Persons, appointed by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, expects to issue early in July the 1954-55 announcement of Fulbright programs for Europe and the Near East, Japan, and Pakistan. The partial data so far received from abroad indicate that there will be an unusually large demand for social scientists. Under most programs individual lecturers and research scholars in the social sciences have been requested, and in at least two countries plans are being made for special "projects" in these fields.

Norway has requested up to six American Fulbright lecturers and research scholars "to provide advanced teaching and research guidance in the fields of political science, sociology, social psychology, clinical psychology, industrial relations and general social science methodology in departments of the University of Oslo, and at the Institute for Social Research in Oslo, giving particular emphasis to the development of theoretical knowledge and methodological skills in the conduct of empirical research . . ."

In an effort to give impetus to social studies and to encourage practical application in the field of urban social welfare, the United States Educational Foundation in Egypt has proposed that Fulbright lecturers and research scholars in sociology and social welfare be assigned to the several Egyptian universities and to those institutes especially concerned with community organization and welfare problems. Particularly desired are specialists in medical and psychiatric case work, social field work training, urban sociology, and community organization. Very likely each grantee will be affiliated with two or three institutions in the area to which he is assigned, and it is expected that wherever possible grantees will pool their efforts to accomplish projects mutually agreed upon by the Foundation, their colleagues in the host institutions, and the grantees themselves.

An award of considerable interest has been announced for Ceylon, with which country a Fulbright Agreement was signed late in 1952. The University of Ceylon lists as its top award a lectureship in economic theory. The Economics Department is currently without a chairman, and the university feels that an able lecturer could contribute a great deal not only through teaching but also through his relationships with other members of the faculty.

Programs for the following countries will be included in the committee's July announcement: Austria, Belgium and Luxembourg, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iraq, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, and the United Kingdom and Colonial Dependencies. Applications for 1954-55 university lecturing or advanced research in these countries must be postmarked no later than October 15, 1953. Program information and application forms may be obtained from the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, Committee on International Exchange of Persons, 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington 25, D.C.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N.Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors, 1953: WENDELL C. BENNETT, RAY A. BILLINGTON, TAYLOR COLE, GORDON A. CRAIG, FRED EGGAN, CHARLES FAIRMAN, LUTHER GULICK, ROBERT B. HALL, ERNEST R. HILGARD, PENDLETON HERRING, E. ADAMSON HOEBEL, ALEXANDER H. LEIGHTON, DONALD G. MARQUIS, DOUGLAS MCGREGOR, JOHN P. MILLER, FREDERICK MOSTELLER, LOWRY NELSON, ROY F. NICHOLS, FREDERICK OSBORN, THEODORE W. SCHULTZ, ROBERT R. SEARS, MORTIMER SPIEGELMAN, GEORGE W. STOCKING, CONRAD TAEUBER, DOROTHY S. THOMAS, SCHUYLER C. WALLACE, HERBERT WECHSLER, S. S. WILKS, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, DONALD YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, *Executive Associate*; HAROLD E. JONES, *Pacific Coast Representative*; BRYCE WOOD; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE; M. BREWSTER SMITH; CAROLYN E. ALLEN, *Financial Secretary*